



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,846	04/12/2001	Edward Clifford Kubaitis	50013.3USU1	2227

7278 7590 01/24/2006

DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
P. O. BOX 5257  
NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257

EXAMINER

TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/833,846

Applicant(s)

KUBAITIS, EDWARD CLIFFORD

Examiner

Cam Y T. Truong

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant has amended claims 1-4, 6-11, 14, 16-17, 20, 24-30, 34, 36-37 and canceled claim 39-40 in the amendment filed on 10/3/2005.

Claims 1-38 are pending in this Office Action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### **Suggestion**

3. In the claim 30, page 7, line 2, the word "HTML" should be spelled out.

4. In the claim 27, "a website" is recited on page 7, line 1; thus, "web site" on page 7, line 3, should be written as "website".

5. In the claim 32, page 7, line 2, the word "extensible" should be written as "Extensible".

6. In claim 17, page 5, line 10, the word "query" should be written as "the database-structured query".

7. In claim 8, page 3, line 2, and the phrase "the determined web domain" should be written as "the determined web domain address".

8. In claim 9, page 3, line 10, and the phrase "the determined web domain" should be written as "the determined web domain address".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 29 and 30 recite the limitation " the provided web domain address " in page 7, line 3 and line 5 of claim 29; page 7, line 3 of claim 30. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11-13, 15, 16, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Madnick et al (or hereinafter "Madnick") (US 5913214).

As to claim 1, Madnick teaches a method for extracting data from a network by a server (col. 3, lines 1-7; col. 1-2);

"creating a database-structured query at the server based, in part, on a user input" as the request translator receives a data request from data receiver 102 and

translates the data request into a query at the wrapper generator 614. The converter query converts at least a portion of the query into a command to interact with a semi-structured data sources such as HTML documents, flat files containing data that are not arranged as a relational database. The above information shows that a command is created based on the data request. The data request from data receiver 102 is represented as a user input. The command is represented as the database-structured query. The wrapper generator 614 is represented as a server (col. 2, lines 46-55, col. 2, lines 30-33);

“determining a web domain address on the network from which to extract the data” as determining a URL on the network to extract the data (table 2, col. 12, lines 1-10, lines 1-5);

“extracting the data from a non-database structured arrangement of data directly based on the determined web domain address and on the database-structured query” as at least a portion of the query is converted into one or more commands which can be used to interact with a semi-structured data source. Those commands are issued and data is extracted from the data source. In this case a source is located at an address or URL. The above information shows that the data is extracted from a semi-structured data source based on the address of the source and the command (fig. 7, col. 10, lines 25-32; col. 2, lines 2-8).

As to claim 2, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “wherein creating the database-structured query further comprises, including a network address within the

Art Unit: 2162

database-structured query indicating a starting point” as creating a command after converting at least a portion of a query, the command includes a network address as URL: <http://quotes.galt.com/>. This URL is indicated as a starting point (Table 2, col. 7, lines 25-32; col. 2, lines 5-10).

As to claim 3, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the determined web domain address, includes at least one universal resource locator (URL)” as the URL (col. 12, lines 5-10, table 2).

As to claim 5, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “wherein creating the database-structured query, further comprises, creating a regular expression within the database-structured query used to determine the data to extract” creating regular expression with a specification file 706 as a command to determine the data to extract (col. 10, lines 2-5; col. 12, lines 5-10, table 2).

As to claim 6, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “wherein directly extracting data from the determined web domain address based on the database-structured query, further comprises, matching a plurality of patterns contained within the regular expression to the data to determine the data to extract” as each variable to be retrieved in a given state, the state description contains a pattern to be matched against the document or semi-structured data source. The above information shows that matching each pattern of each variable contained with the regular expression (col. 15, lines 1-10).

As to claim 10, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation "reshaping at least a portion of the extracted data for use by at least one data analysis software program" as extracted data is translated by the data translator from the data context of the data source into the data context associated with the initial request. It means that the extracted data is reshaped by translating. The above information shows that the system has included a data analysis software program to translate the extracted data (col. 3, lines 6-8).

As to claim 11, Madnick teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for extracting data from a network (a memory having one or more commands to issue to the web page in order to retrieve the data from a network, col. 3, lines 21-26), "the computer-executable instruction enabling actions" (commands are enable for accessing the data and retrieving the data. Accessing and retrieving are represented as actions (col. 3, lines 20-26) comprises:

"creating a database-structured query including a web domain address used for locating data, based, in part, on a user input" as the request translator receives a data request from data receiver 102 and translates the data request into a query. The converter query converts a least a portion of the query into a command to interact with a semi-structured data sources such as HTML documents, flat files containing data that are not arranged as a relational database. The above information shows that a command is created based on the data request. The data request from data receiver

102 is represented as a user input. The command is represented as the database-structured query (col. 2, lines 46-55, col. 2, lines 30-33);

“locating the data based on the web domain address” as the descriptor file 702 may be a directory of URL addresses which locate necessary information about the data source 104. The above information shows that the data source is located based on the URL addresses. The URL address is represented as the web domain address (col. 10, lines 27-30),

“ wherein at least a portion of the data is located based on the web domain address provided by the database structured query” as extracting the requested web pages to the wrapper generator 614 in response to the transmitted commands (col. 9, lines 55-67; col. 10, lines 1-5);

“extracting at least the portion of the data from a non-database structured arrangement of located data directly based on the database-structured query from the located, wherein the data-structured query is performed upon the non-database structured arrangement of located data” as at least a portion of the query is converted into one or more commands which can be used to interact with a semi-structured data source. Those commands are issued and data is extracted from the data source. In this case a source is located at an address or URL. The above information shows that the data is extracted from a semi-structured data source based on the address of the source and the command (fig. 7, col. 10, lines 25-32; col. 2, lines 2-8).



As to claim 12, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the database-structured query, further comprises, a network address included within the database-structured query, further comprises, a network address included within the database-structured query indicating a starting point” as creating a command after converting at least a portion of a query, the command includes a network address as URL:

<http://quotes.galt.com/>. Quotes.galt is indicated as a starting point (Table 2, col. 7, lines 25-32; col. 2, lines 5-10).

As to claim 13, “wherein the network address, further comprises at least one universal resource locator (URL)” as URL (col. 12, table 2).

As to claim 15, “wherein the database-structured query, further comprises, a regular expression within the database-structured query used to determine the data to extract” as a regular expression with the file 706 as the database-structured query (col. 12, table 2).

As to claim 16, “wherein the regular expression within the database-structured query, further comprises at least one pattern, used to determine the data to extract” as each variable to be retrieved in a given state, the state description contains a pattern to be matched against the document or semi-structured data source. The above information shows that matching each pattern of each variable contained with the regular expression (col. 15, lines 1-10).

As to claim 24, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the web domain address further comprises at least one link address for locating at least a portion of the data" (fig. 7).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 4, 14 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick et al (or hereinafter "Madnick") (US 5913214) in view of Hennings et al (or hereinafter "Hennings") (US 6763496).

As to claim 4, Madnick does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "following links contained within the web domain until the links have been exhausted or following the links until a predetermined limit is reached". Hennings teaches following the links until the Caribbean.htm is reached. Caribbean.html is represented as a predetermined limit (fig. 8).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hennings' s teaching of following the links until the Caribbean.htm is reached to Madnick's system in order to response to a customer's request for more detailed information about a document on a web page.

As to claim 14, Madnick does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation

“at least one link to another web domain address for locating data to extract”.

Hennings teaches at least one link:<http://www.traveltickets.com> to

<http://www.traveltickets.com/cruises> for locating Caribbean data to extract (fig. 8).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hennings’ s teaching of at least one link:<http://www.traveltickets.com> to <http://www.traveltickets.com/cruises> for locating Caribbean data to extract to Madnick’s system in order to response to a customer’s request for more detailed information about a document on a web page.

As to claim 25, Madnick does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “at least one link address that is followed to locate data to extract until a predetermined number of links is reached”. Hennings teaches following the links until the Caribbean.htm is reached. Caribbean.html is represented as a predetermined limit (fig. 8).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hennings’ s teaching of following the links until the Caribbean.htm is reached to Madnick’s system in order to response to a customer’s request for more detailed information about a document on a web page.

14. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick et al (or hereinafter “Madnick”) (US 5913214) in view of Jammes.

As to claim 7, Madnick does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein creating the database structured query, further comprises, creating a condition expression with the database structured query describing how to scan the data at the determined web domain address for the data to extract”. Jammes teaches as the following is one example of a name/value pair representing a query generated by the Initial\_Event\_Handler to extract product data related to the root level group: query =select Product\_name, Product\_ID From Relationships, Groups where ID\_type = G and ID=1000 and relationship = Contains And (col. 22, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Jammes’s teaching of the following is one example of a name/value pair representing a query generated by the Initial\_Event\_Handler to extract product data related to the root level group: query =select Product\_name, Product\_ID From Relationships, Groups where ID\_type = G and ID=1000 and relationship = Contains to Madnick’s system in order to retrieve data in different type of data structures corresponding to a user’s request.

As to claim 8, Madnick discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation “wherein directly extracting the data from the determined web domain, further comprises: retrieving data from the determined web domain address; reducing the retrieved data to a region of interest; and searching the region of interest for the data matching a predetermined regular expression”.

Jammes teaches the claimed limitations:

“retrieving content from the web domain address” as the web server 106 receives the request message and examines a URL 1808 embedded in the request message. The Web server 106 scans the URL 1808 embedded in the request message and recognizes that a template file 1810 named Auto.html is requested. The web server then invokes an HTML page engine process. The HTML page engine opens the template file 1810, which is a text file 1812. The file 1812 includes ASCII text, HTML tags, and query scripts. The HTML page engine finds a query script 1814. The query script 1814 specifies that a query be performed against the product information database 116 to determine all groups or products related to an automotive group having a Group\_ID 1816 of 60004. This information shows that the query script 1814 has to be retrieved from URL 1808 to specify a query (fig. 18, col. 18, lines 20-45).

“reducing the retrieved content to a region of interest” as an HTML coded result set: web/sedans.html>Sedans </A. This information shows the system reduced the retrieved content to a region of interest as A (col. 22, lines 22-45);

“searching the region of interest for the data matching a predetermined regular expression” as a database search command employing pattern matching on particular fields of data records facilitates construction of data structures underlying a search results group 338 (col. 26, lines 25-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Jammes’s teaching to Madnick’s system in order to Madnick’s system in order to retrieve data in different type of data structures corresponding to a user’s request.

As to claim 9, Madnick discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein directly extracting the data from the determined web domain, further comprises, storing the data matching the predetermined regular expression". Jammes teaches retrieving data records whose status fields match a predetermined status value and that a corresponding result set would be generated. This information shows that the system stores matched records (col. 26, lines 25-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Jammes's teaching of retrieving data records whose status fields match a predetermined status value and that a corresponding result set would be generated to Madnick's system in order to backup a system when the system is corrupted.

15. Claims 17-23, 26, 27, 28, 30-34, 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick in view of Iizuka et al (or hereinafter "Iizuka") (US 6424980).

As to claim 17, Madnick teaches the claimed limitations:

"a client computer system having a client network connection to the network and communicating with a server computer system" as (col. 3, lines 60-67; col. 4, lines 1-5);

"the server computer system having a server network connection to the network and communicating with the client computer system" as (col. 3, lines 60-67; col. 4, lines 1-5), "the server computer system further configured to perform actions, comprising:

receiving the database-structured query from the client computer system” as the request translator receives a data request from data receiver 102 and translates the data request into a query. The converter query converts a least a portion of the query into a command to interact with a semi-structured data sources such as HTML documents, flat files containing data that are not arranged as a relational database. The above information shows that a command is created based on the data request. The data request from data receiver 102 is represented as a user input. The command is represented as the database-structured query (col. 2, lines 46-55, col. 2, lines 30-33);

Madnick does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “the client creating a database-structured query, based, in part, on a user input”.

Iizuka teaches client 100 creating a database structured query based, in part, on a user input (fig. 39, col. 13, lines 35-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Iizuka’s teaching of client 100 creating a database structured query based, in part, on a user input to Madnick’s system in order to retrieve data contained in a plurality of semi-structured documents over open network quickly and further eliminate network traffic when server receives multiple user’s request from at the same time.

As to claim 18, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the database-structured query, further comprises, a network address within the database-structured query indicating a starting point” as (table 2, col. 12, lines 5-10).

As to claim 19, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “a regular expression within the database-structured query used to determine the data to extract” as (col. 10, lines 2-5; col. 12, lines 5-10, table 2).

As to claim 20, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the regular expression with the database-structured query further comprises at least one pattern used to determine the data to extract” as (col. 10, lines 2-5; col. 12, lines 5-10, table 2).

As to claim 21, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “an editor for creating a template of regular expressions used to extract the data” as (col. 12, lines 5-10, table 2).

As to claim 22, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “ at least one data extraction engine to extract the data” as (col. 15, lines 25-35).

As to claim 23, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the data extraction engine is a web crawler” as the wrapper generator 614 (col. 15, lines 25-35).

As to claim 26, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the web domain address further comprises a link address, wherein at least another portion of the data is located with the link address” as (col. 9, lines 55-67; col. 10, lines 1-5).



As to claim 27, Madnick teaches the claimed limitations:

“creating a database-structured query at the server based, in part, on a user input” as the request translator receives a data request from data receiver 102 and translates the data request into a query at the wrapper generator 614. The converter query converts a least a portion of the query into a command to interact with a semi-structured data sources such as HTML documents, flat files containing data that are not arranged as a relational database. The above information shows that a command is created based on the data request. The data request from data receiver 102 is represented as a user input. The command is represented as the database-structured query. The wrapper generator 614 is represented as a server (col. 2, lines 46-55, col. 2, lines 30-33); “determining a website to search based in part on the database-structured query” as determining a URL on the network to extract the data implies determines a website (table 2, col. 12, lines 1-10, lines 1-5);

“extracting at least a portion of the data relevant to the query at the web site directly based on the database-structured query” as extracting the requested web pages to the wrapper generator 614 in response to the transmitted commands (col. 9, lines 55-67; col. 10, lines 1-5);

“wherein the website is processed as a searchable database” as the data receives 620 receives the web pages and extracts the requested data from those pages. The above information shows that each web page or website is a searchable database (col. 10, lines 1-5);

“the database-structured query is performed upon at least a non-database arrangement of the data at the website” as each command is performed upon flat files containing data that are not arranged as a relational database at the website or web page (col. 2, lines 27-32; col. 9, lines 55-67; col. 10, lines 1-5).

“the extraction of at least the portion of the data is from the non-database arrangement of the data” as extracting the data from the HTML documents that the non-database arrangement of the data (col. 2, lines 27-32; col. 10, lines 1-5).

As to claim 28, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “parsing the database-structure query to determine at least one link to search at the website” as (col. 12, lines 1-20, table 2).

As to claim 30, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “determining what data to extract based in part on the database-structured query and the provided web domain address” as (col. 12, lines 1-20, table 2).

As to claim 31, Madnick and Iizuka teach the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 27, Iizuka further teaches the claimed limitation “wherein extracting data based in part on at least one of an HTML table, a binary file, and a matching pattern” as extracting data based on an HTML table (col. 14, lines 34-40).

As to claim 32, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “reshaping the extracted data for at least one of a database, a spreadsheet, extensible Markup Language (XML) display, and a statistical tool” as (col. 3, lines 1-8).

As to claim 33, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the website is a starting website based in part on the database-structured query” as (col. 10, lines 1-5).

As to claim 34, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation:  
“generating a database structured query based, in part, on user input” as the request translator receives a data request from data receiver 102 and translates the data request into a query at the wrapper generator 614. The converter query converts a least a portion of the query into a command to interact with a semi-structured data sources such as HTML documents, flat files containing data that are not arranged as a relational database. The above information shows that a command is created based on the data request. The data request from data receiver 102 is represented as a user input. The command is represented as the database-structured query. The wrapper generator 614 is represented as a server (col. 2, lines 46-55, col. 2, lines 30-33);

“determining at least one webpage with the data, wherein the determination of the webpage is provided by the database-structured query” as extracting web pages that contains data by the commands (col. 9, lines 55-67; col. 10, lines 1-5);

“parsing the data at the at least one webpage in search of data that satisfies a query condition” as (col. 15, lines 1-10; table 2, col. 12, lines 1-20);

“wherein the data at the at least one web page is directly processed as though it is a searchable database” as the data receives 620 receives the web pages and extracts the requested data from those pages. The above information shows that each web page or website is a searchable database (col. 10, lines 1-5);

“ the query is performed upon a non-database structured arrangement of the data at the at least one web page” as each command is performed upon flat files containing data that are not arranged as a relational database at the website or web page (col. 2, lines 27-32; col. 9, lines 55-67; col. 10, lines 1-5);

“extracting at least a portion of the data from the parsed data of the at least one webpage that satisfies the query condition” as extracting data at a web page that satisfies the query condition (col. 15, lines 1-20);

“wherein the extraction of at least the portion of the data is from the non-database structured arrangement of the data” as extracting the data from the HTML documents that the non-database arrangement of the data (col. 2, lines 27-32; col. 10, lines 1-5).

Madnick does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “reshaping the extracted data to a predetermined format”. Iizuka teaches outputting the search result in a prescribed single format that is specific to each user. In particular, converting the search result into the item presentation styles of each user according to the style conversion data (col. 5, lines 5-10; col. 5, lines 35-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Iizuka’s teaching of outputting the search result in a

prescribed single format that is specific to each user. In particularly, converting the search result into the item presentation styles of each user according to the style conversion data to Madnick's system in order to provide a good view of a search result to a user's system for viewing easily.

As to claim 37, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the structured query is generated to parse a limited portion of the data of the at least one webpage with the limits predetermined by the user" as (col. 12, lines 1-10, table 2).

As to claim 38, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation "wherein structured query is generated to search for at least one of a text string, a table, and a predefined list of words" as (col. 2, lines 30-55).

16. Claims 29, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick et al (or hereinafter "Madnick") (US 5913214) in view of Iizuka et al (or hereinafter "Iizuka") and further in view of Hennings et al (or hereinafter "Hennings") (US 6763496).

As to claim 29, Madnick teaches the claimed limitation "determining at least one other website to search based in part on the database-structured query and the provided web domain address" as (col. 9, lines 55-67; col. 10, lines 1-5).

Madnick does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "extracting at least another portion of the data at the at least one other website based on the database-

Art Unit: 2162

structured query and the provided web domain address, wherein the at least one other website include a non-database structured arrangement of data that is processed as a searchable database". Hennings teaches extracting Golfing data at a second web page. This web page includes a HTML document as a non-database structured arrangement of data (fig. 8).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hennings's teaching of extracting Golfing data at a second web page to Madnick's system in order to retrieve data contained in a plurality of semi-structured documents over a network.

As to claim 35, Madnick does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the search of data is performed on at least a second webpage". Hennings teaches at least one link:<http://www.traveltickets.com> to <http://www.traveltickets.com/cruises> for locating Caribbean data to extract (fig. 8).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hennings' s teaching of at least one link:<http://www.traveltickets.com> to <http://www.traveltickets.com/cruises> for locating Caribbean data to extract to Madnick's system in order to response to a customer's request for more detailed information about a document on a web page.

As to claim 36, Madnick does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein parsing the data of the at least one webpage further comprises following links included

Art Unit: 2162

on the webpage and further parsing the data of webpages determined by the links included on the webpage". Hennings teaches a first web page comprises links and parsing data as shown in fig. 1B to determine links included on the web page (fig. 8).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hennings' s teaching of a first web page comprises links and parsing data as shown in fig. 1B to determine links included on the web page to Madnick's system in order to response to a customer's request for more detailed information about a document on a web page.

### ***Conclusion***

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Call (US 64184410.

### **Contact Information**

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cam Y T Truong  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2162  
1/20/2006